

## CLEARY GOTTLIB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

ONE LIBERTY PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10006-1470  
(212) 225-2000

FACSIMILE (212) 225-3999

WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

WASHINGTON, DC • PARIS • BRUSSELS • LONDON • MOSCOW  
FRANKFURT • COLOGNE • ROME • MILAN • HONG KONG  
BEIJING • BUENOS AIRES • SÃO PAULO • ABU DHABI • SEOUL

Writer's Direct Dial: +1 212 225 2508  
E-Mail: cboccuzzi@cgsh.com

LAURENT ALPERT  
VICTOR I LEWKOW  
LESLIE N SILVERMAN  
ROBERT L TORTORELLO  
LEE C BUCHHEIT  
JAMES M PEASLEE  
THOMAS J MOLONEY  
JONATHAN I BLACKMAN  
MICHAEL L RYAN  
ROBERT P DAVIS  
YARON Z REICH  
RICHARD S LINCER  
STEVEN C HOROWITZ  
JAMES A DUNCAN  
STEVEN M LOEB  
CRAIG B BROD  
MITCHELL A LOWENTHAL  
EDWARD J ROSEN  
LAWRENCE B FRIEDMAN  
NICOLAS GRABAR  
CHRISTOPHER E AUSTIN  
SETH GROSSHANDLER  
WILLIAM A GROLL  
HOWARD S ZELBO  
DAVID E BRODSKY  
ARTHUR H KOHN  
RICHARD J COOPER  
JEFFREY S LEWIS  
PAUL J SHIM  
STEVEN L WILNER  
ERIKA W NIJENHUIS  
LINDSEY P GRANFIELD  
ANDRES DE LA CRUZ  
DAVID C LOPEZ  
CARMEN A CORRALES  
JAMES L BROMLEY  
MICHAEL A GERSTENZANG  
LEWIS J LMAN  
LEV L DASSIN

NEIL O WHORISKEY  
JORGE U JUANTORENA  
MICHAEL D WEINBERGER  
DAVID LEINWAND  
DIANA L WOLLMAN  
JEFFREY A ROSENTHAL  
ETHAN A KLINGSBERG  
MICHAEL J VOLKOVITSCH  
MICHAEL D DAYAN  
CARMINE D BOCCALZI, JR  
JEFFREY D KARPF  
KIMBERLY BROWN BLACKLOW  
ROBERT J RAYMOND  
LEONARD C JACOBY  
SANDRA L FLOW  
FRANCISCO L GESTERO  
FRANCESCA L ODELL  
WILLIAM L MCRAE  
JASON FACTOR  
MARGARET S PEONIS  
LISA M SCHWEITZER  
JUAN G GIRALDEZ  
DUANE MCLAUGHLIN  
BREON S PEACE  
MEREDITH E KOTLER  
CHANTAL E KORDULA  
BENET J O'REILLY  
DAVID AMAN  
ADAM E FLEISHER  
SEAN A O'NEAL  
GLENN P MCGRORY  
MATTHEW P SALERNO  
MICHAEL J ALBANO  
VICTOR L HOU  
ROGER A COOPER  
AMY R SHAPIRO  
JENNIFER KENNEDY PARK  
ELIZABETH LENAS  
LUKE A BAREFOOT

PAMELA L MARCOGLIESE  
PAUL M TIGER  
JONATHAN S KOLODNER  
DANIEL L'AN  
MEYER H FEDIDA  
ADRIAN R LEIPSI  
ELIZABETH VICENS  
ADAM BRENNEMAN  
ARI MACKINNON  
JAMES E LANGSTON  
RESIDENT PARTNERS  
SANDRA M ROCKS  
S DOUGLAS BORISKY  
JUDITH KASSEL  
DAVID E WEBB  
PENELOPE L CHRISTOPHOU  
BOAZ S MORAG  
MARY E ALCOCK  
DAVID H HERRINGTON  
HEIDE H ILGENFRITZ  
HUGH C CONROY, JR  
KATHLEEN M EMBERGER  
WALLACE L LARSON, JR  
JAMES D SMALL  
AVRAM E LUFT  
ANDREW WEAVER  
HELENA K GRANNIS  
GRANT M BINDER  
JOHN V HARRISON  
CAROLINE F HAYDAY  
DAVID FLECHNER  
RESIDENT COUNSEL  
LOUISE M PARENT  
OF COUNSEL

December 29, 2015

### BY ECF AND HAND

Honorable Thomas P. Griesa  
United States District Court for  
the Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, New York 10007

Re: *Seijas v. Republic of Argentina*, No. 04 Civ. 400 (TPG); and related cases

Dear Judge Griesa:

I write in response to plaintiffs' letter dated December 22, 2015. As a result of the objections set forth in our prior letters to the Court, the *Seijas* plaintiffs have by and large fixed the various deficiencies in their proposed proof of claim form. However, as to the one outstanding issue concerning distribution of plaintiffs' form, plaintiffs have submitted a proposed order requiring the Republic to "provide *whatever* authorizations" various clearing systems "*may* require to clear away *any bureaucratic issues*" with distributing plaintiffs' proof of claim form. ECF No. 281-2 (Dec. 22, 2015) (emphasis added). We do not object in principle to providing ministerial authorizations to the clearing systems. But as we explained in our prior letters to the Court, the Court should reject paragraph four of plaintiffs' proposed order because it would impose obligations that are entirely speculative and undefined. *See* Rep. Ltr. at 2, ECF No. 280 (Dec. 17, 2015); *see also* Rep. Ltr. at 4, ECF No. 278 (Dec. 14, 2015).

Proposed orders "should be clear, specific, and precise." *United States v. Chalmers*, No. S505 Cr. 59 (DC), 2007 WL 591948, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 27, 2007). That is particularly true where, as here, a proposed order could have the unintended consequence of shifting burden or expense to a class action defendant, in violation of well-settled law. *See* Rep. Ltr. at 2-4, Dkt. 278 (Dec. 14, 2015) (citing precedent that plaintiffs bear the burden of establishing damages and providing notice to members of their class). Here, plaintiffs provide no explanation for what

Hon. Thomas P. Griesa, p. 2

“bureaucratic issues” they anticipate or what form or type of “authorizations” their proposed order would require. Nor have they established that complying with such obligations would be reasonable or practicable under the circumstances. Thus, the Court and the Republic are left to guess what plaintiffs’ proposed order compels and whether such an order complies with the law.

Moreover, any potential benefit from the inclusion of plaintiffs’ vague provision is purely hypothetical, as plaintiffs have made *no* showing that an order to provide “authorizations” is necessary to disseminating plaintiffs’ proof of claim form. Instead, the only evidence in the record shows that DTC would distribute plaintiffs’ form without any further action by the Republic. *See id.* at 3.

In the event the clearing systems do require action from the Republic, we can meet and confer with plaintiffs promptly to devise an appropriate solution without burdening the Court.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Court strike the fourth paragraph of plaintiffs’ proposed order before entering it. Alternatively, if the Court is inclined to enter the proposed order as is, we request that the order preserves the Republic’s ability to object to the extent of any improper burden or requirement sought to be imposed by plaintiffs on the Republic vis-à-vis the clearing systems.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmine D. Boccuzzi

cc: Counsel of Record (by ECF)

---

<sup>1</sup> We have made clear our willingness to meet and confer with plaintiffs throughout these proceedings. *See Rep. Ltr. at 1-2, ECF No. 278 (Dec. 14, 2015).* Plaintiffs’ proposed order and revised proof of claim form adopt many of the edits we first proposed on December 8, demonstrating that most if not all of the parties’ disputes could have been resolved with dialogue rather than letter writing to the Court, as the Court’s December 1 Order instructed. *See id.*